EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DAVID BOREN OKLAHOMA

RUSSELL BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20510

621 NORTH ROBINSON OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73102 United States Senate

211 EAST OAK SEMINOLE, OK 74868

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3601

March 10, 1993

Acting Director Office of Legislative Affairs Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, Room 808 Washington, D.C. 20554

SENATE CHAIRMAN JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

MEMBER, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON FINANCE CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION

MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL TRADE

RECEIVED

APR 1 2 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Sir/Madam:

I recently received a letter from one of my constituents expressing concern about PR Docket 92-235. I respectfully request that this letter be given full consideration; however, no response to my office is necessary. I am enclosing a copy for the record.

Sincerely,

David L. Boren

United States Senator

DLB/mcf Enclosure

> No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDE

Small David Bren US Small Washington DC 2050, Dem Smaller Bren

I am a retired person who returned to model building in 1972 as a means of reloxation after a least attach. Since that time, I lower built a number of lones. Must cost from \$500° to 2000 and home sever to nine foot wir gapon. I am a member of the Tulan gave Dobbers by which is a local club of 250-300 members who shore my holy.

The Federal Communications Commission has recently proposed charges in the 73 Mbg + 75 Mbg frequencies that me now when fixing our model planes. The proposed charges - PR Dorket 92-235 - would make model flying extremely charge ones. The sopty regulations would not our flying after protect not only the club members but also the large number to spectators that visit our field. The sules charges proposed in the FCC Dorlet would allow commanied mobile users to "about down" our aircraft putting money params in longer. Many to the planes from at the field weigh 10-30 penuls and feely from 60-100 mpl through the flying, we must continue to love interference free frequence.

Bloom lesp me and others to continue the safe enjoyment to overholding by not allowing the FCC to commy out the proposals spelled out in PR Dorlet 92-235

Imaly

5311 5 73 nd 8 came
Tuls- 01 74145

The Honorable David Boren U.S.Senate Washington.D.C.20510

Dear Senator Boren,

1993 FEB 23 AM 9: 03

It has just recently come to my attention that a proposed rule change is under consideration by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) that if adopted will seriously reduce the usability of frequencies currently assigned for model use and greatly increase the risk of serious accidents in the operation of Radio Controlled models.

I am retired and get many hours of enjoyment from the design.construction, and operation of Radio Controlled Model Air raft. I have been doing this for some 40 years and have competed at the local, national, and international level.

Our Radio Control frequencies are in the 72-76 Mhz band. This band is shared with private land mobile dispatch operation. Our frequencies are far enough apart from the land mobile use that we have been able to share the band with out interfering with one another.

The FCC now wants to rearrange the band plan again (they did it previously in 1991) to create more mobile land frequencies by splitting them into narrower band widths. As a result, many land mobile frequencies will move close enough to existing R/C frequencies as to cause catastropic radio interference. I have been advised by experts that of the 50 channels now available for radio control of model aircraft only 19 will be left if PR Docket 92-235 is adopted.

Thousands of people are employed in this phase of the hobby industry and at a time when our new president is trying to create new jobs it seems untimely for a gov't, agency to institute plans that will certainly prove detrimental to that effort.

I think it unwise of the FCC to try to improve the operating conditions of land mobile users at the expense of the some 200,000 radio control modelers. Their interests would be better served if they cleaned up the usage they now have. One only has to monitor those 'business' transmissions a short time to realize that much of the business is in reality 'monkey' business. The FCC may not think we are as important as the 'business' users, but we have considerable investment of both time and money in our models and radio equipment.

The hobby provides many hours of enjoyment to thousands like myself and contributes immeasurably to the aviation industry. I urge you to help me continue the SAFE enjoyment of my hobby by not allowing the FCC to implement the proposals for the 72-76 Mhz band as outlined in PR Docket 92-235. I have included a copy of my letter to the FCC. It might shed some light on specifics should you need it.

am sincere⊅

∕ames L. Steinberg 555 So. 99th E. Ave.

Tulsa, Okla, 74128

Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington.DC 20554

Dear Sirs,

I was recently made aware of an a proposed rule change by the FCC that is sure to have a severe impact on a hobby that is very important to me and the 200+ members of the Radio flying club I belong to. We fly radio controlled (R/C) aircraft.

The rule change is in NPRM Pr Docket 92-235 which replaces Part 90 of your rules with a new Part 88. Part 90 provides for the SAFE operation of R/C models by requiring a 10 Khz spacing between fixed commercial users and we citizens that enjoy the various radio controlled hobbies. The new part 88 allows mobile users on frequencies within 2.5 Khz of the frequencies available to us, thereby virtually eliminating the SAFE use of at least 31 of the 50 channels now used by model aircraft and 10 of the 30 frequencies on the 75 mhz. band. In actuality all frequencies will probably be affected if past history is any indicator i.e. the CE fiasco of the 60's and 70's.

The passing of this proposal will have a drastic affect on myself and a debilitating impact on the entire R/C hobby industry that employs thousands of persons. If put into effect it (the proposal) will provide commercial mobile users with the capability of 'shooting down' my aircraft thereby endangering my personal safety and that of those around me for a radius of several miles, and would certainly result in the loss of valuable personal property (several hundreds of dollars per aircraft) and possible loss of life or limb.

I have been involved in this hobby for over 40 years. I own and operate 6 radios and 6 aircraft. In 1991 I had to have several radios upgraded (narrow-banded), at a cost of several hundreds of dollars added to a total investment of around \$4,000, to comply with 10Khz demands, only now to have them made usless if PR Docket 92-235 is put into effect. When you consider that there are several hundred thousand others like myself who derive immense joy and satisfaction from the hobby, the rule change will severly detract from our quality of life both economically and in terms of enjoyment.

The AMA(Academy of Model Aeronautics) has gone to great pains to maintain one of the best safety records of any sport or hobby. The continued use of interference free frequencies is the only way to maintain this admiable record.

I strongly urge you to reconsider this rule change. Keep the 10 Khz spacing between frequencies on 72 and 75 Khz so that all R/C'ers may continue to enjoy the hobby that has grown each and every year for the past 50 years. Thousands of people are supported financially by the hobby so don't eliminate their jobs or the enjoyment we all get by participating in the hobby.

I would like a response from you or your office as to how you voted on this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

James L. Steinberg

555 So. 99th East Ave. Tulsa,Okla, 74128